

Appl. No.: 10/661,393
Amdt. Dated: May 30, 2006
Reply to Office action of Feb. 28, 2005

Amendments to the Drawing:

None. The drawing was accepted by the official draftsman in the first Office action.

Appl. No.: 10/661,393
Amdt. Dated: May 30, 2006
Reply to Office action of Feb. 28, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The examiner's Office action of February 28, 2006 has been carefully considered and is appreciated. Applicant confirms a telephone consultation with the examiner in which the examiner agreed that the present Office action should not have been made FINAL because new prior art was cited in the Office action, namely U.S. 5,755,433 Klein, and U.S. 6,237,837 Martin. Therefore, it is believed that extensive amendments should be entered into the file and evaluated. After the Amendment of November 22, 2005, the case includes claims 1--4, and 7-20, all of which were rejected in the Office action of February 28, 2006. The case was originally filed with 20 claims, with claims 1, 10 and 17 being independent. Claims 10-10 and 20 were allowed in the first Office, action, but that allowance was withdrawn in the second Office action. Original claim 19 was rejected on the grounds that it includes only a method step.

In this response, claims 1-2, 4, 7-10, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19, 20 have been amended and claims 3, 11, 14, 15 and 18 have been canceled. New claims 21-24, all dependent on claim 17, and new claim 25, dependent on claim 1, have been added.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the further limitation of a transparent reminder pocket that is secured to the flat pattern blank on only three sides and leaving the top edge unsealed, which naturally provides an opening for inserting a reminder means. The related new claim 25 adds the limitation that there is an ungummed margin

Appl. No.: 10/661,393

Amdt. Dated: May 30, 2006

Reply to Office action of Feb. 28, 2005

along the edges of the reminder pocket, or address window, which provides an inner and outer layer forming the pocket that holds a reminder card. It is believed that none of the references cited disclose or suggest this type of reminder pocket in an envelope. There is no actual pocket accessible from the outside of the envelope itself, as is the case with the present invention shown in Powell or any other reference cited in the case. Again, use of the transparent mailing address window as a reminder pocket accessible from the outside surface of the envelope is made possible by omitting a glue strip along one side of the window, and an ungummed margin about the cut-out address window make it truly a pocket, which is not shown in the prior art of record.

Claim 2 has been amended to add the limitation of printing the reminder notice upside down, which facilitates user insertion of the reminder card into the reminder pocket.

Claim 3 has been canceled.

Claim 4 has been amended to add the limitation of the placement of the reminder card on the envelope, which is important because it facilitates its removal by the user, as it is always easier to remove a perforated tab or the like when one edge of the perforation lies along an existing edge of the whole piece from which the perforated portion will be removed. This limitation also further distinguishes the present invention from Powell, in which a removed perforated envelope portion covers the address window and reveals the

Appl. No.: 10/661,393

Amdt. Dated: May 30, 2006

Reply to Office action of Feb. 28, 2005

address window when removed. In the present case, the address window is transparent and always visible for use in providing access to the mailing address until a user inserts a reminder card or the like into the reminder pocket.

Claims 5-6 were previously canceled.

Claim 7 has been amended to add the limitation that the address window becomes the reminder pocket when so utilized by the recipient. The prior art of record does not disclose or suggest such a construction.

Claim 8 has been amended to specify and limit the present invention in more detail, including the printed fold line that provides essential guidance to the user in assembling the easel-type display from the envelope itself and the perforated lines that are torn to provide the supporting back of the display. Although both Fox nor Transport show an easel-type display, neither utilizes a portion of the back of an envelope detached along perforated lines to form the back of the easel and neither suggests or discloses this structure as claimed.

Claim 9 has been amended to clarify the limitations of the set up display in which the base is flat and horizontal so that it is fully in contact with any horizontal supporting surface, which is not shown or suggested in either Fox or Transport. In both these cases, the portion corresponding to applicant's base 130 are elevated from front to back and rely on edges only for support. In applicant's invention, the materials used are lighter weight,

Appl. No.: 10/661,393
Amdt. Dated: May 30, 2006
Reply to Office action of Feb. 28, 2005

not cardboard or the like, and the additional support provided by having the entire width of the base in contact with the supporting surface is important to the successful operation of the invention. Further, the supporting upstanding flange covers the outside surface of the display supporting panel 98, whereas in Transport a standard slot and inserted arrow member are used and in Fox a depending flange is fastened to the inside surface of the upright support 4. This is an important difference because it is easier for the user to assemble the present invention into a reminder display because the user can see where to attach the upstanding adhesively coated flange and have it in front of him when he peels off the release strip, whereas in Fox, the attachment of the two corresponding members is a blind operation that must be performed almost wholly as a matter of touch. because the user cannot see the two surfaces that are being adhered to each other while carrying out this assembly step. These remarks also apply to the like limitations in claims 16, 17.

Claim 10 has been amended to include significant limitations regarding the structure that leads to the display mode as shown in Fig. 15, 16 for example, also discussed above.

Claim 11 is currently canceled.

Claim 12 has been amended to add the clear limitation that the address window has an unsealed top edge allowing it to serve as the reminder pocket, as set out in the discussion of claim 1 above. In this regard, claim 13 has been amended to add the

Appl. No.: 10/661,393
Amdt. Dated: May 30, 2006
Reply to Office action of Feb. 28, 2005

limitations of the manner of attaching the transparent window over the address window, namely leaving the bottom edge as seen in Fig. 1, which becomes the top edge of the reminder pocket, unglued.

Claims 14, 15 are currently canceled.

Claim 16 as amended is discussed above in regard to the related claim 9.

Claim 17 is the narrowest independent claim and has been amended to add the limitations of the exact placement of the reminder card, which is different from the prior art of record, e.g., Powell and is important for facilitating removal of the reminder card; and the limitations regarding the easel-type display supporting member, as discussed above in relation to claim 9.

Claim 18 has been currently canceled.

Claim 19 has been amended to clarify placement of the reminder card on the exterior surface of the completed, assembled and sealed envelope in a fashion not suggested or disclosed in any of the prior art of record because none discloses or suggests a reminder card that is printed on the envelope and a pocket integral with the outside of the envelope in which to place the reminder card for display.

Claim 20 has been amended to add the limitations regarding the thickness, placement and size of the magnet which is essential to the successful suspension of the display envelope from a refrigerator or the like.

Appl. No.: 10/661,393

Amdt. Dated: May 30, 2006

Reply to Office action of Feb. 28, 2005

Claims 21-24 are new and add limitations claiming the envelope access slot panel 152 (e.g., Fig. 12) at the bottom of the envelope, which, when removed, forms the envelope access slot 168 that allows users to insert items into the envelope and the reminder display pocket from the outside of the envelope as shown in Fig. 13 and to stack a number of items inside the reminder display window without obscuring the article previously presented for viewing through the reminder display window. Each subsequent claim in the group of claims 21-24 adds further limitations to this basic structure. The structure of an envelope access slot permitting access to a reminder display window is not shown or suggested in any of the prior art references of record in this case.

With these amendments, it is believed that all the claims now in the case are now allowable over the prior art of record, which, either alone or in conjunction with each other, neither discloses nor suggests the present invention as now claimed. Therefore speedy allowance of all claims now in the case is requested.


RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 30 2006

Appl. No.: 10/661,393
Amdt. Dated: May 30, 2006
Reply to Office action of Feb. 28, 2005

Please call the undersigned attorney at (913) 897-6738 in regard to this application
if desired.

Respectfully Submitted,




Kenneth W. Iles
PTO Registration Number 30,395
Attorney for Applicant
Telephone (913) 897-6738
Facsimile (913) 681-0493

Kenneth W. Iles
Law Offices of Kenneth W. Iles
9903 West 129th Street
Overland Park, KS 66213-3222

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION (FAXING) UNDER 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to the
Central Facsimile Telephone Number MAY 30, 2006.


Signed: Kenneth W. Iles

30 MAY 2006
Date: